DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 237 198 PS 013 913

AUTHOR Markovitch, Martha L.
TITLE Improving Language Skills through the Use of Specific Learning Centers and Language Experience Activities with First Grade Children.
PUB DATE Jun 82
NOTE 66p.; Master's Practicum Report, Nova University.
PUB TYPE Dissertations/Theses - Practicum Papers (043)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Class Activities; Classification; Classroom Research; Concept Formation; Educationally Disadvantaged; Grade 1; *Grouping (Instructional Purposes); *Language Acquisition; Language Experience Approach; *Language Skills; *Learning Centers (Classroom); Listening Comprehension; Primary Education; Speech Communication
IDENTIFIERS Nova University FL

ABSTRACT

A practicum study designed to address the problem of inadequate language development skills in first-grade children was conducted. Specifically, efforts were directed toward developing and implementing a specialized instructional program to remediate students' deficiencies in listening comprehension, basic concept skills, classification skills, and oral expression. A learning-center approach combined with the language-experience method comprised instruction for 15 children in the target group. Instruction was provided for approximately 90 minutes a day, 5 days a week, for a period of 4 months in an environment where children could interact with each other and with materials, make decisions, and express themselves freely. Control group members (14 children) received instruction by a basal-reader approach in a conventional first-grade classroom. Test results indicated that a large percentage of students in the target group achieved the projected increases on posttests when their scores were compared with pretest performances. A few control group students also showed significantly increased scores. Recommendations for future program refinement were suggested. (Appendices include charts of center instruction skill strands, a sample center ticket, and a reading/school attitude survey). (Author/BJD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED237198

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

NOVA UNIVERSITY

IMPROVING LANGUAGE SKILLS THROUGH THE USE OF SPECIFIC LEARNING CENTERS AND LANGUAGE EXPERIENCE ACTIVITIES WITH FIRST GRADE CHILDREN

by

MARTHA L. MARKOVITCH

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Martha L. Markovitch

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

A Practicum Report

Submitted to the Faculty of the Center for the Advancement of Education of Nova University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science

June/1982

PS 013913

Authorship Statement

I hereby testify that this paper and the work it reports are entirely my own. Where it has been necessary to draw from the work of others, published or unpublished, I have acknowledged such work in accordance with accepted scholarly and editorial practice. I give this testimony freely, out of respect for the scholarship of other workers in the field and in the hope that my own work, presented here, will earn similar respect.

Martha L. Markovitch

Martha L. Markovitch

Abstract

Improving Language Skills through the Use of Specific Learning Centers and Language Experience Activities with First Grade Children. Markovitch, Martha L., 1982: Practicum Report, Nova University, Center for the Advancement of Education

Descriptors: Basic Skills/Behavior Development/Class Activities/ Classification/Classroom Communication/Classroom Environment/Classroom Techniques/Contingency Management/Disadvantaged Environment/Disadvantaged Schools/Discovery Learning/Elementary Education/Educational Games/ Individualized Instruction/Language Acquisition/Language Experience Approach/Learning Activities/Learning Centers (classroom)/Learning Readiness/Listening Comprehension/Oral Interpretation/Oral Language/ Primary Education/Speech Communication

This practicum addressed the problem of inadequate language development skills of disadvantaged first grade children. The purpose of the study was to develop and implement a specialized instructional program to remediate students' deficiencies in listening comprehension, basic skills, classification, and oral expression.

A learning center approach combined with a language experience method of instruction was used as a strategy to implement the program. Children in the target group received instruction in an environment where they could interact with each other and materials, make decisions, and express themselves freely, for approximately 90 minutes a day, five days a week, for a period of four months. The control group was instructed in a conventional first grade classroom using a basal reader approach.

Formal testing results indicated that a large percent of students in the

target group achieved the projected increase in their percentile scores on the posttest when compared with their scores on the pretest. Of the students in the control group, only a few increased their scores by any significant difference when pre- and post-testing results were compared. Recommendations for future program implementation have been made and considerations for program refinement have been suggested. The practicum describes student preparation for center instruction, detailed program implementation, a center management system, and center evaluation procedures. (Appendices include center instruction skill strands, a sample center ticket, and a reading/school attitude survey).

Table of Contents

Page

Title Page i

Authorship Statement ii

Abstract iii

Table of Contents v

Observer's Verification vi

Chapter

1 Purpose 1

2 Research 7

3 Method 19

4 Results 29

5 Recommendations 36

Bibliography 39

Appendices

Appendix A: Reading/School Attitude Survey 42

Appendix B: The Center Ticket 43

Appendix C: Center Instruction Skill Strands 44

Appendix D: Center Instruction Skill Strands: The Addition of a Learning Station 51

NOVA UNIVERSITY
CENTER FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF EDUCATION
3301 College Avenue
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33314

OBSERVER VERIFICATION FORM

Verification of Practicum Activity

Dear Observer:

Practicum students in Nova's M.S. and Ed.S. programs are asked to provide external verification that the project activities reported in their final practicum documents took place as described. You have been designated an observer to fulfill this confirmation function by the student named below. On this sheet, then, please write a note attesting to your knowledge of the project activity described in the final practicum report to which this will be attached. (Note that you are not asked to evaluate, or make judgments about the quality of the project.)

Mrs. Martha L. Markovitch has completed a practicum entitled Improving Language Skills through the Use of Specific Learning Centers and Language Experience Activities with First Grade Children. I observed the classroom periodically during the implementation period. I examined some of the materials used and observed the target group at work. To my knowledge she has completed this study as described herein.

Practicum Title Improving Language Skills through the Use of Specific Learning Centers and Language Experience Activities With First Grade Children

Student's Name Martha L. Markovitch

Program Site Daytona Beach, Florida Date July 9, 1982

Observer's Name John P. Vodenicker
(Please print ---------- and sign)

Observer's position Principal John P. Vodenicker

Chapter 1

Purpose

The elementary school involved in this study was located on a fifteen acre site in a low socio-economic area of the city. The school plant had twenty-six classrooms in the main building, one SLD classroom, a media center, cafetorium, stage, offices and storage areas. Several of the storage areas were used as instruction and testing areas. There were eleven portables on the school grounds. The twenty-six classrooms were appropriate for class size. Each grade level had access to a teacher workroom with adequate space and facilities for grade level meetings, planning sessions, and small group instruction. Other instructional areas, including the SLD classroom, speech therapy classroom, art and music rooms, and portable classrooms, were inadequate as to size, function or location.

The school population was comprised of 54.2% white students, 43.3% black students, and 2.5% Hispanic, Asian, Indian, and "other" origins. A survey sent to parents of the students at the beginning of the 1979-1980 school year indicated that only 35.5% of the parents completed high school, 8.3% graduated from college, and .5% held an advanced degree. Over one-half of the 810 students participated in the free lunch program and 9.1% were on reduced lunch. This school had a higher than average number of transfer students. This can be partially attributed to the fact that the school zone included large areas of rental properties and mobile homes. Approximately 307 students were bused in daily from the mobile home areas called "busing islands". The transient nature of the school may also be attributed to the inflationary economic conditions

and the fact that it is located in a resort area.

The changing student population necessitated flexibility of curriculum organization. The teachers worked within the county curriculum policies which included a pupil competency program and a pupil progression plan. They were free to choose instructional sequence, emphasis and materials as needed, but were somewhat restricted to a school-wide basal reading series. The personality and training of the teacher, class composition, individual needs of students and available instructional materials determined the teaching styles, strategies and methodologies used. The majority of classes were held in self-contained classrooms. The students were heterogeneously grouped and identified for classes by the guidance counselor and the office staff on the basis of balancing the number in each class according to ability, race, sex, and disciplinary problems. Within the classroom, children were grouped for reading instruction based on test scores and teacher judgment.

The problem examined in this practicum occurred in a first grade classroom of twenty-three students. The classroom population consisted of four white girls, six white boys, four black girls, eight black boys, and one boy of Hispanic origin. These students seemed to have a somewhat negative attitude toward school and toward reading. Discipline problems were apparent. Their teacher, a black female, had twenty-four years of experience in kindergarten and grade one and had a Master's Degree in elementary education.

The researcher who conducted this study held the position of Primary Resource Teacher, (PRT), under a Florida law called the Primary

Education Program, referred to as PREP. It was within her job description that she provide supportive, academic services to teachers and children. Some of her specific duties included the diagnosing of students' needs, and providing individual and/or small group instruction in the primary grades. Assisting in the interpretation of tests results and in the follow-up of the findings, were among the major responsibilities which fell directly under the PRT's job targets for grade one. The Primary Resource Teacher worked under the supervision of county level administration and was directly responsible to the principal of her school.

A problem surfaced during the fall of 1981 when the interpretation of test results revealed that an exceedingly high percentage of low scores in language skills occurred in one first grade classroom when compared with the other three classes. The teacher's concern and the principal's encouragement prompted this researcher to pursue the problem in finding an effective method of remediating the language skills of these identified students. The target group, those students scoring a raw score of ≥ 10 on the MRT and assigned to Class A, involved fifteen students of which two girls and four boys were white and three girls and six boys were black. The control group, those students interspersed among the other three classrooms, and also scoring ≥ 10 on the MRT, included fourteen students of which three boys were white and six girls and five boys were black.

The following problem was addressed in this study. Fifteen stedents (65%) of one first grade class of twenty-three fell below a raw

score of ten of a possible eighteen on the language section of the Metropolitan Readiness Tests, Level II, Form P. These students should have scored within a raw score range of at least twelve or thirteen in order to predict some success in grade one. Since language is one of the skill areas especially relevant to readiness for beginning reading instruction, it seemed apparent that a definite weakness in language development skills existed among these students. An examination of school records indicated unsatisfactory academic performance in language skills in all but four of the cases. On the language section of the Metropolitan Readiness Tests given the previous year in kindergarten, two students had raw scores slightly higher than ten. No test scores were available for the other two students.

The language section of the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills, Level B, Form S (CTBS) was used as a pretest and administered to both the target and control groups of students. It was determined that, in order to proceed with some success in grade one, these students should have achieved a raw score of at least 23 of a possible 34, a percentile rank of 48.

Results of the pretesting indicated that thirteen students in the target group fell considerably below the 48th percentile. One student scored exceedingly above and one fell at the 48th percentile. In the control group, eleven students scored measurably below the 48th percentile, one scored well above, and two students fell at the 48th percentile rank.

Conferences held with the teachers of the students in both groups

further verified the test results. Based upon their observations and judgments of the students' academic progress and class participation, they rated these students as well below average in language skill development.

A reading/school attitude survey (Appendix A) was given to the target group. The survey revealed that only about half of these students liked school and liked to read. Most of them liked to check out books from the library and would like to receive a book as a gift. Almost all of them thought of themselves as good readers, but felt that their teacher didn't think that they read well. Many of the students did not like school work and did not seem to like their reading groups. They apparently liked the other children in the class, but felt that they were not well-liked. About two-thirds of them wished that they were in another classroom and felt that school was not a very exciting place to be.

Generally, this survey indicated that many of these students were not very fond of school but did seem to like their classmates. Their attitude toward books appeared favorable, but some discontentment in their reading instruction was apparent.

It was projected that the following outcome objectives would be achieved by the students in the target group by the end of the implementation period.

1. Over a period of four months, the target group would show improvement in their listening comprehension skills as evidenced by an increase of at least ten points as measured by the difference between

percentile scores on the language section of the CTBS administered before and after the implementation of the practicum.

2. Over a period of four months, the target group would show improvement in their basic concepts skills, (spatial, size, quantitative, and temporal), as evidenced by an increase of at least ten points as measured by the difference between percentile scores on the language section of the CTBS administered before and after the implementation of the practicum.

3. Over a period of four months, the target group would show improvement in their classification skills, (classifying according to one and two categories), as evidenced by an increase of at least ten points as measured by the difference between percentile scores on the language section of the CTBS administered before and after the implementation of the practicum.

4. Over a period of four months, the target group would show improvement in their oral expression skills as evidenced by an increase of at least ten points as measured by the difference between percentile scores on the language section of the CTBS administered before and after the implementation of the practicum.

5. Over a period of four months, the target group would show improvement in their attitude toward reading and school as evidenced by their own reports indicated on a reading/school attitude survey given before and after the implementation of the practicum.

Chapter 2

Research

Reading specialists, in increasing numbers, are recognizing the relevance of the development of the child's language skills for reading success. Teachers are realizing that learning to read is more than simply saying the words. If educators think of reading in the sense that reading is thinking with words, children with poorly developed language skills cannot really learn to read. Reading progress is almost impossible when children cannot mentally frame sentences to express what they wish to say (Spache, 1972).

Bond (cited in Lee & Allen, 1963, p. 131) believes that language facility is one of the more important readiness factors that are definitely trainable. Although the development of communication skills begins in the home, society recognizes that skillful use of language in all its aspects requires years of instruction and practice. Since the ability to use language well is closely linked with success in most prestige occupations, it is imperative that educators effectively and efficiently teach the communication skills of listening, speaking, reading and writing. There is widespread agreement among educators that these communication skills are related and that the experiences of children, including their language experiences, are essential ingredients for successful education programs (Lee & Allen, 1963).

Children whose preschool environment has been unfavorable for normal language development and whose experiences have been extremely limited are not ready for a textbook pre-reading program. The concern here is that these children may lack the language development needed to under-

stand the oral directions and the variety of cultural experiences necessary to understand the pictures and the common situations used in the context sentences. Such children are disadvantaged and not only need their background experiences broadened, but special language programs which concentrate on listening and speaking (McKee & Harrison, 1966).

Sensitive teachers who consider the fact that most children come to school speaking other than the language found in published reading materials, can prevent many initial reading difficulties experienced in linguistically diverse learners. To begin formal reading instruction through the language experience approach which capitalizes on the child's language competences and experiences, is one way to minimize differences between oral and written English (Wheat, Galen, & Norwood, 1979).

Koeller (1981) reminds us that the most potent and effective curriculum aid available to elementary teachers is the oral language that the child brings to school. She encourages teachers to create classroom environments where a lively oral language program introduces basic skills and uses vocabulary development strategies that build concepts.

Donoghue (1971) cites two elementary school projects, developed under Project English, that list oral and written language development and language use as their main objectives. Both projects center their programs around students being actively involved in the preparation and use of materials as basis for their curriculum in an atmosphere conducive to learning.

In a program initiated by the New Haven, Connecticut Public Schools called Urban Education Studies and Rural Education Studies (cited in

Donoghue, 1971, pp. 438-439), educators felt that prepackaged, traditional materials provided neither motivation for language development nor improved teaching techniques. They developed a program which focused on the encouragement of oral and written thought and expression through the use of large photographs with which students could identify. Through these pictures, children were encouraged to comment, discuss, demonstrate and role play.

The development of a series of books which were organized, written and shared by students was the main focus of Books for Children by Children (cited in Donoghue, 1971, p. 436), a project also based in New Haven, Connecticut. The objectives of this project were to encourage oral and written expression, improve motivation and interest for reading and writing by realizing that reading is actually a person's own or someone else's thought and words preserved in writing, and to involve children actively in creating their own curriculum. The series of books written by these children and all materials from the English Program of the United States Office of Education has been prepared for distribution to teachers and schools.

Psychologists, reading specialists, and reading teachers agree that it is an innovative teacher who creates an atmosphere for learning. Her choice of materials should help individualize instruction and at the same time make learning to read exciting, interesting, and pleasurable (Amato, Carroll, Cladfelter, Gaines, Hamp, Lucero, & Williams, 1976). The student's learning environment should include reading activities that take the forms of games and puzzles that permit "hands-on" learning ex-

periences. Inexpensive properties for creative dramas, tape recorders, record players and other media should be available to promote language development (Donoghue, 1971). There is no valid reason for students to learn reading skills through the dull-dry-drill method. Reading should be stimulating and interesting and can be through the use of independent learning activities in an environment that meets individual differences (Spache, 1972).

By providing a classroom setting where most student work is done in learning centers, much can be done to enhance language development (Stansell, 1978). Children today must have the opportunity to explore all facets of their language, of how language works and how they can better control the use of language today and in the future (Fillmer, Lecourt, Thompson, Coon & Cramer, 1974).

In a paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Conference on Language Arts, Stansell (1978) defends the use of learning centers as a strategy for classroom instruction at a time when the back-to-basics movement was demanding greater emphasis on drill and exercise instruction. He cites examples of students' work and achievement in illustrated centers that prove that learning centers are not frills which interfere with learning but are effective means of instruction. The learning centers promote the use of the learners' own language and thought as a foundation for instruction. Stansell strongly advocates that learning centers represent a natural way of implementing the language experience approach. He concludes his paper by saying that the use of learning centers is a fundamental strategy for the enhancement

of children's ability as language users. In addition, learning centers enable teachers to effectively integrate all of the language arts in any given center.

Werner (1981) believes that integrating language expression with movement enables children to see relationships, not just isolated subjects, and that children deserve an approach to curriculum which gives meaning to their lives. He urges physical education instructors and teachers to work together and develop a methodology to integrate language with movement expression. He points out that language is the most important skill children learn in school and suggests a method of teaching through learning centers, simulations, games and other learning modes involving movement. Language and movement expression can abound in a practice center where children practice familiar tasks, or in a discovery center where they learn new concepts. The relationship between language expression and movement can be reinforced through the encouragement to read books about sports, athletes, dancers and the like. Such integrated experiences could lead to career interests and develop aesthetic appreciation for movement.

James (1975) presents a different concept of the learning center environment. She advocates learning center instruction within a center of learning and describes a program for disadvantaged students implemented in a Pensacola, Florida, elementary school. This school was an old one in a community of low-income residents which served children in kindergarten through grade three. There were approximately 300 students of which 70% were black. The faculty of the school decided that

reading improvement would be a major priority for all children. With parent support, they set up a learning center, consisting of two classrooms, and designed a program that combined openness with prescriptive teaching, independence with structure and language development with reading instruction. Within the center, special areas or learning stations were set up for instruction and reinforcement of skills. Small groups of children were sent to the center at scheduled times. The language experience approach was used and student tutors assisted children in learning stations. Because of adjustments of many kinds, including attendance which fluctuated greatly on any given day, it was not possible to predict the extent of improvement that could be shown on standardized tests. Observation revealed that the students made overall progress in social, emotional, and academic areas. A significant outgrowth of children's progress was the improved skills of teachers in identifying students' needs and the construction of classroom and center activities to meet their needs.

A similar program for disadvantaged children, called the Primary Language Development Component was developed by the Columbus Public Schools (Brierly & Robinson, 1971). Both programs served students in kindergarten through grade three, established a center of learning within a school with special areas designated for learning, and scheduled small groups of students for instruction. The Primary Language Development Component was, however, implemented in many elementary schools at the same time. The two programs differed in their ways of utilizing the learning center. The Primary Language Development Com-

ponent was implemented directly through special instructional services and activities by classroom teachers and language development teachers. In the program implemented by James (1975), children were apparently permitted more freedom to learn on their own. James experienced success in her program supporting the belief of many educators that children can achieve more when they are more actively involved in their own learning. The Columbus Public Schools did not achieve their expected results. Their evaluation report, at the end of three years, indicated moderate success in realizing the component's objectives. The program had a significant impact on the scores of children at the kindergarten level. The individual performances of students at each grade level in the primary grades demonstrated improvement in listening comprehension ability, reading achievement, and written language skills. Group data, however, showed that large percentages of students at each grade level did not attain expected levels of age and achievement. Based on these results, a recommendation was made to continue the program for one more year with greater emphasis on instruction at the kindergarten and first grade levels.

Although a program developed by Winkler and Paro (1972) was designed for students in the intermediate grades, consideration should be given to the strategy they used to remediate deficiencies in children's language development skills. These teachers in a Santa Barbara, California, school spearheaded and developed a special functional reteaching program to fill the gaps in children's learning. They and their committee planned a new approach to reading for 55 intermediate

grade students who were being promoted without reaching their grade levels in reading. They organized four diagnostic teaching centers. As the students rotated through the four centers, a profile was developed for each student based on teachers' observations of his strengths and weaknesses. After studying the observational data and the behavioral remarks, the committee discovered that most of the 55 students indicated a deficiency in language skills. Further testing was done to survey the automatic language skills of each student. An item analysis of the tests served as a basis for setting up four functional reteaching centers. The overall program developed for these students provided a stress-free learning environment with a no-grade label. Instruction was done in small groups or individually using teacher devised games and activities. Emphasis was placed on self-direction and responsibility. An evaluation of the program disclosed that their objectives had been reached. The students were demonstrating more independence and there was noticeable improvement in their study habits. Comprehension, oral expression and word attack skills had improved. Hyperactivity had decreased and the ability to attend to a task involving reading had been extended. The children seemed to enjoy reading and there was evidence that they were reading at home and on their own.

Hidden outcomes can sometimes justify the work and planning involved in implementing the learning center approach. Learning centers create a free learning atmosphere where children can move and interact with each other. Movement and interaction are natural developmental tendencies that children must and will express as they function normally in this

world. Learning center environments aid in the developing of a child's responsibility to himself and others. They can realize that they, and no one else, govern what they do and how they behave and that their behavior may influence or infringe upon the rights of others. Learning centers develop self-directed learners. One of the goals of the educational system is the development of citizens who can make decisions about their future and the future of the nation (Davidson & Steely, 1978).

Borba and Borba (1978) developed a learning center approach to teaching as a convenient way to organize and incorporate their materials into their daily lesson plans. They discovered that they not only had found an organizational method that worked, but that their students were more interested in the same lessons they were teaching before and were learning more. Although no statistical data was given, they contended that student academic achievement was supported by posttest results. These teachers have become strongly committed to the belief that children learn best if they are allowed to be active participants in their own learning.

Based on a research of literature, the decision was made to combine a learning center approach with the language experience method as a strategy to implement this practicum. The children identified as the target group apparently lacked the necessary language development skills to succeed in school as evidenced by results of the language sections of the Metropolitan Readiness Tests administered in the fall and the CTBS administered in the winter. No significant growth was noted to occur between testing dates in most cases, when a basal reader approach was

used to instruct these children in a traditional classroom setting. Based on these factors, and the belief that young children need to be actively involved in their own learning in an atmosphere conducive to learning, the strategy chosen seemed appropriate.

The first grade classroom, where the target students were currently enrolled, served as the place for strategy implementation. The researcher had the permission and support of the principal and the classroom teacher to proceed with the study using a learning center approach combined with the language experience method as a means of instruction.

A time period of 90 minutes every morning was set aside and an alternative time was agreed upon in the event that daily schedules were interrupted. Classroom supplies for the target group were shared between the PRT and the teacher. The PRT assumed the responsibility for room arrangement and the center setting. She also made all the learning center activities and tapes used by the students and furnished the materials. The audio-visual equipment needed was obtained from the school media center. Student test booklets were furnished at no cost by the county testing director.

For the purpose of this study, the term "learning center" was defined as:

1. the physical areas where a student or students can work on or obtain learning activity materials;
2. a collection of thought-provoking activities where students can interact with learning materials; and
3. a system for moving students away from teacher-

directed experiences and into student-selected activities for learning.

Setting. The classroom housed 23 students of which 15 were the identified target group in a typical classroom setting. Plans made to convert this room into a learning center environment were:

1. setting up four main learning centers, called learning stations, which focused on listening comprehension, basic skills, classification, and oral expression;
2. providing and coding numerous teacher-made, "hands-on", multi-leveled center activities and tapes that taught, reinforced, and/or enriched skills and concepts that were housed in the main centers;
3. arranging, within the oral expression learning center, the additional necessary materials to implement a language experience method of reading instruction;
4. establishing "free" centers, including interest and exploratory and listening centers, which were self-directed with self-correcting activities shared by all the students;
5. devising a management system that allowed student movement and interaction and promoted a maximum of learning.
6. establishing times when the PRT and the classroom teacher could confer to monitor student progress;
7. facilitating a mini-program permitting peer teachers

to observe the practicum implementation; and

8. meeting with all the students in the classroom and soliciting their input for some of the changes that would take place in their classroom.

Chapter 3

Method

Full implementation of this practicum concluded after a period of five months. During the first month, the researcher acquainted herself with the students and prepared the class for changes that would occur. The classroom was rearranged, learning stations were constructed, and center activities and tapes were made. The center activities used in the learning stations were geared to the needs of the target group based upon the language sections of the Metropolitan Readiness Test results and the CTBS pretest administered earlier. The activities in the interest centers, exploratory centers and the listening center were selected from a list of ideas solicited from the students and teacher. These centers were called "free" centers and were used by all the students in the classroom.

The strategy implementation plan itself occurred over a four month period, for approximately 1½ hours a day, 5 days a week, with a target group of 15 children divided into two groups. The participants of each group were selected in agreement with the classroom teacher in order to disallow unwarranted interruptions in her normal classroom routine. At the end of the four months, these students were posttested on the language sections of the CTBS.

Preparation of students. Since only the target group would be working with the researcher and participating in the learning center activities in a classroom where other students were also taught, it seemed important to also involve the other students, to some extent, in the over-all plan. A class meeting was held to discuss the changes that

would take place. It was decided that the other students in the room would use the "free" centers (interest centers, exploratory centers, and the listening center), with teacher permission, during the time the target group was in their learning stations with the PRT. The classroom teacher and all of the students were involved in the selection of a theme for the setting, room arrangements, and some of the activities for the "free" centers. Students and the classroom teacher also helped devise a plan to monitor center housekeeping and set behavior standards. Total class co-operation was encouraged and student reaction was most gratifying.

The classroom teacher agreed to monitor the center activity of the students who were in the room, but not a part of the target group. The control group, those low-scoring students interspersed in the other three first grade classrooms, remained in their regular classrooms using the basal reader approach.

Center management. Before the students could successfully perform in centers, it was felt that they should be prepared to handle certain responsibilities. During the first month of implementation, each student in the target group was issued a clothespin with his/her name on it. Students by groups were taken on a tour of the centers and shown how to "pin-up" on tabs placed in each center area. The number of tabs displayed denoted the number of students allowed in a center at any one time. The students were instructed in proper center behavior and on how and when to clean up the center they had just used. When the children could accept these responsibilities, a center ticket (Appendix B) was

issued daily to each child. The students were trained on how to use these center tickets and allowed a few practice days.

The center ticket was the key to the monitoring of center activities and student behavior. The four areas of center instruction, listening comprehension, basic skills, classification, and oral expression were listed on the center ticket. Each student was responsible for completing at least one center in each of the four areas every day. Upon checking the student's work, the PRT initialed the student's ticket in the appropriate places. If all activities were done within the designated time, the PRT made a star on the ticket. If the student was observed as exhibiting proper behavior and attitude during center time, an additional star was made on the ticket.

At the close of center time, the student dropped his ticket in a special box which was saved until the end of the week. On Fridays, a treasure chest was opened and each student redeemed his tickets for a reward. To be eligible for a reward, a student must have earned four one-starred tickets. If he had earned four two-starred tickets, he was entitled to an additional prize.

Procedure. The target group was divided into two groups and were referred to as Group 1 and Group 2. At a designated time, both groups reported to the PRT in the learning stations area. Assignments were made based on the following schedule.

Daily Schedule for Center Time

9:00 a.m. - 10:30 a.m.

30-minute periods	Language experience instruction	"Free" centers: interest/exploratory/ listening centers	Learning stations (four areas)
1st period	Group 2	Group 1	
2nd period	Group 1	Group 2	
3rd period			Groups 1 & 2

Group 1 was assigned to work in the "free" centers where they interacted with self-directed and self-checking activities. Group 2 remained with the PRT and was instructed in communication skills, using a language experience method. After 30 minutes, the two groups changed places. At the end of the second period, both groups and the PRT moved into the learning stations where students engaged in learning center activities in specific skill areas (Appendix C). Each picked up his/her clothespin and center ticket and proceeded to his tasks, working independently or with a partner. The PRT remained with the students, offering assistance and encouragement, checking students' work, and marking the tickets. During this time, she also recorded any problems noted and/or special observations made.

The students were dismissed after 90 minutes of participation in the center setting. They then resumed their responsibilities to their regular classroom teacher.

After about two weeks into the strategy implementation, it seemed necessary to stop and possibly retrain the students working independently

in the "free" centers. These students began interrupting the PRT during the time she was with students in language experience instruction to show her what they had done or to issue complaints. The daily schedule was waived for two days. The students were divided into three groups and taken through the "free" centers routine alternately with seatwork activities. By remaining with them during their "free" center time, it was learned that they seemed to understand the procedure and could work well, but that there was a need for immediate praise and reinforcement for what they had done. Two carefully selected sixth grade students were asked, with permission of their teachers, to assist the students during each of these 30-minute periods. The PRT observed this situation for two days. The student-to-students relationship seemed to work well and no further serious problems occurred. The daily schedule was then resumed.

At about the same time, another difficulty was encountered. Originally language experience instruction was held in the oral expression station within the classroom. Two factors attributed to another adjustment in the strategy implementation. It was soon discovered that the children in the target group were much more deficient in language development skills than was thought initially. Previously made lessons plans were discarded and a new set was made. It became obvious that these students also needed to learn how to behave in small group instruction before any real learning could take place. Lessons became impossible in the classroom where the target children were easily distracted because of noise. This factor combined with the fact that the PRT was

being interrupted by the classroom teacher and asked to aid in solving class behavior problems prompted the researcher to move language experience instruction into the teachers' workroom. In this very quiet environment, it was felt that much learning took place both behaviorally and academically. The move did not seem to interfere with the alternating groups working in the "free" centers with the assistance of the sixth grade students. When Group 1 and Group 2 exchanged places between periods 1 and 2, the PRT circulated through the "free" centers making sure center movement was running smoothly.

The strategy implementation went very well for about seven weeks. Interest and enthusiasm were high and the children seemed to gain more independence daily in their learning activities. Slow but steady growth in academic progress was noted, behavior began to improve and more children were earning two-starred center tickets. However, the tasks for the PRT during the 3rd period, when both groups were brought together, soon became overwhelming. In the beginning, the students often chose to do the same center activities over or to choose centers requiring less time and thought. As they began to choose centers which demanded more time and interaction and offered more challenges, the PRT felt a need to be closer to the students and to spend more time with individuals. A new daily schedule was devised, adding 10 minutes which divided center time into four 25-minute periods instead of three 30-minute periods. A new learning station was set up called Center-Makings (Appendix D) where students engaged independently in making their own learning center activities to use at their seats or to take home. The following revised

daily schedule for center time was followed successfully throughout the remaining weeks of the study.

Daily Schedule for Center Time (revised)

8:50 a.m. - 10:30 a.m.

25-minute periods	Language experience instruction	"Free" centers: interest/exploratory/ listening center	Learning stations (4 areas)	Center-Makings station
1st period	Group 2	Group 1		
2nd period	Group 1	Group 2		
3rd period			Group 2	Group 1
4th period			Group 1	Group 2

The addition of the new learning station, Center-Makings, served more than one purpose. Children learned of the time and thought that went into the making of a learning center activity. The making of their own center activities also served as an aid in building respect for the property of others.

It was observed that the children in the classroom very often took things from each other and from the "free'centers in the room. Because of the apparent lack of discipline and perhaps poor classroom management, the PRT, in the beginning, moved all center materials and tapes used with the target group into her own room at the end of every session. This became a daily chore. Several total class meetings and teacher conferences were held which resulted in the PRT leaving the materials for the target group in the room and the setting up of centers and learning center

activities for the other children. Materials for the "free" centers were replenished. An interesting observation was made. The center activities made for the other children often disappeared and parts of some were either taken or lost. Only a few items were found missing from the "free" centers. However, the materials used by the PRT for the target group remained intact and apparently were never touched when the PRT was out of the room.

The new learning station was shared with the other students in the room near the end of the strategy implementation period. The results were most rewarding. More center activities were given to the students and better care of materials was observed. Problems with center materials previously experienced were at a minimum. Perhaps if this station had been opened up to all the students at the onset of this study, many problems with center materials could have been avoided.

Center evaluation. The researcher was totally involved with students in the target group during their learning station activities. Upon completion of a learning center activity, the student's work was checked immediately and problems and observations were noted. This checking and involvement allowed for daily, on-the-spot evaluation of the student's academic progress and behavior. This evaluation was combined with observations made during language experience instruction to monitor student progress. By following this method of evaluation, the researcher was also in a position to evaluate her own center organization and materials.

Class meetings with the target group were held at least once a week, more often in the early stages of practicum implementation. Prob-

lems were discussed, center rules and behavior standards were reviewed, and input from the students was obtained. This time was not in lieu of center instruction. The daily center tickets were distributed and discussed. Those students who had earned a reward chose their prize or prizes from the treasure chest.

These class meetings proved invaluable. Students looked forward to them not only because they could redeem their center tickets but also because they had learned to enjoy peer interaction. Improvement in attitude was observed and the students seemed to gain more respect for each other. Many good suggestions came from the students and were followed through whenever possible. The PRT and the students experienced some trying times in the class meetings in the beginning, but the end results were worth all the efforts.

Because of the somewhat complexity involved in the organization and implementation of a learning center approach to instruction, and the unique setting in which it took place, some problems were anticipated and did occur. The adjustments and modifications of the strategy implementation that were made did not seem to effect the over-all plan of the study. Good progress in language development skills were made by the target group, behavior and attitude seemed to have improved, and the total class seemed happier.

The PRT planned to facilitate a mini-program that permitted peer teachers to observe the practicum implementation. This was done on a lesser degree than proposed. Some of the teachers throughout the school made periodic visits. The three other first grade teachers were very

much aware of the strategy implementation and made occasional visits to observe. Discussions regarding its progress were held with individual teachers but not in group sessions. Time played a major role in providing adequate inservice for the teachers.

Chapter 4

Results

It was projected by the researcher that, after five months of specialized instruction in language development skills, the target group would show improvement in their listening comprehension, basic concepts, classification, and oral expression skills. These improvements would be evidenced by an increase of at least ten points as measured by the difference between their percentile scores on the language sections of the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills, Level B, Form S, administered before and after the implementation of the practicum.

Table 1 contains pre- and post-testing results and gains and losses in percentile scores for each child in the target group and the control group. A gain in score, (indicated by a (+) in the table) was registered for any student who had increased his/her percentile rank on the language sections of the posttest when compared with his scores on the language sections of the pretest. A (-) meant that the language score had decreased when a comparison was made of the pre- and post-testing results.

The study began with 15 students in the target group, these students located in one first grade classroom, and 14 students in the control group, those students interspersed among the other three first grade classrooms. It concluded with 14 students in the target group and 12 students in the control group. Three students moved during the five month period of implementation and no posttest results could be obtained.

Table 1

Summary of Gains and Losses in Percentile Scores on the Language Sections of the CTBS for Each Student

Target group				Control Group			
Students	Pre-test[a] %ile	Post-test[b] %ile	Difference	Students	Pre-test[a] %ile	Post-test[b] %ile	Difference
1 A	16	68	+52	1 B	5	33	+28
2 A	36	60	+24	2 B	16	30	+14
3 A	12	33	+21	3 B	43	46	+3
4 A	5	26	+21	4 B	40	41	+1
5 A	48	68	+20	5 B	32	30	-2
6 A	28	46	+18	6 B	9	7	-2
7 A	7	23	+16	7 B	48	37	-11
8 A	32	46	+14	8 B	28	15	-13
9 A	12	26	+14	9 B	19	3	-16
10 A	84	94	+10	10 B	48	30	-18
11 A	12	17	+5	11 B	40	15	-25
12 A	24	26	+2	12 B	71	33	-38
13 A	19	15	-4	13 B	24	-	-
14 A	12	4	-8	14 B	7	-	-
15 A	32	-	-				
Mean	25.26	39.42	14.64		30.71	26.66	-6.58

[a]Normed table for Grade 1: 1.3 to 1.5 (Dec., Jan., Feb.)

[b]Normed table for Grade 1: 1.6 to 1.9 (Mar., Apr., May, June)

The target group (students located in one first grade classroom of 23 students). Ten students (71%) increased their percentile scores by 10 points or more. Of these 10 students, five (50%) showed a gain of 20 points or more. Four students (29%) scored well above the 48th percentile rank. Two students (14%) showed a slight increase in their scores and two students (14%) showed a decrease in their scores. Student 1A appeared to have improved the most, gaining 52 points above his pretest percentile score. This child and student 7A demonstrated marked behavioral improvement throughout the study and it was felt by the classroom teacher and the researcher that this may have contributed greatly to the gains made in their scores.

The control group (students interspersed among the other three first grade classrooms). Two students (17%) increased their percentile scores by 10 points or more as indicated on the posttest. Of these two students, one student showed a gain in his percentile score by more than 20 points. None of the students in the control group reached the 48th percentile rank on the posttest. Eight students (67%) showed a decrease in their percentile scores and two students (17%) showed a slight increase in their scores. Student 1B had obtained the lowest score on the pretest and made the greatest gain on the posttest. Previous test scores indicated on student 2B's cumulative school record supported the testing results achieved by her in this study. However, this student's excellent reading ability and classroom performance reported by her teacher may be indicative of her true learning ability. The problem of scoring low on tests may rest with this student's inability to take a test. The

teacher of student 10B informed the researcher that excessive absences may have been a contributing factor in the decrease of this student's percentile score. While student 10B was considered a low average student, the teacher felt that the posttest score was not a true indication of her classroom performance and ability.

It was also projected by the researcher that the target group would show improvement in their attitude toward reading and school as evidenced by their own reports on a reading/school attitude survey administered before and after the implementation of the practicum.

The post reading/school attitude survey revealed that most of the students liked school and liked to read. All but two students said that they liked to come to school every day. Their positive attitude toward books and their self-impressions of being good readers remained the same. Many of the students indicated that they liked to do their school work and enjoyed their reading groups. Over half of this group equated their classroom assignments with work done in centers. The students again indicated that they liked the other children in the class and a few more felt that they were well-liked by their classmates. The children's attitude toward their classroom remained about the same. Based upon the researcher's observations, the students seemed to like their teacher, yet almost two-thirds of them said that they wished they were in another teacher's classroom.

Discussion. The subjective impressions of the researcher and the classroom teacher were that a large number of students in the target group had made much improvement in their language development skills

during the course of the program. Both felt that even more improvement was made in student behavior. Two girls who were initially passive children had become more assured and outgoing. The majority of the students, who were very aggressive and were considered as having severe behavioral problems, had developed better self-control and concentration. The language of the children had become somewhat more comprehensible and their ability to follow directions had improved. Improvements were also noted in their willingness to attempt more difficult tasks in learning center instruction.

The impression of improvement obtained by the researcher was substantiated by the results of formal testing. Since 71% of the students in the target group increased their percentile scores by 10 points or more and half of these students increased their scores by 20 points or more, it could be surmised that the program to remediate the language development skills of these children was successful. It must be noted, however, that only three students scored above the 50th percentile rank. These scores obtained at the end of the first grade do not indicate probable success in a regular second grade program.

At no point during the course of the study did the researcher anticipate that the test results would indicate such a drastic improvement of oral language skills when a comparison of scores was made between those of the target group and the control group. An analysis of the study and of the test results produced the following probable reasons for the wide discrepancy in test results between the scores of the two groups.

All of the students involved in the target group and the control group were considered disadvantaged children with moderate to severe behavioral problems. It is not surprising to find urban disadvantaged children low in language development skills if by "disadvantaged children" we mean those whose pre-school environments have been unfavorable for normal language development, and whose experiences have been extremely limited. Such children need a special language program and even then, it may be necessary to continue the remedial oral language program and to add to their cultural experiences for several years (McKee & Harrison, 1966). Children who receive no special instruction could possibly show regression in their language development on a normed test when compared to the average child.

The fact that only students in the target group received approximately 137 hours of specialized instruction in language development and based on the theory that regression can occur if such skills are not remediated, it seems plausible to assume that these facts could account for some of the discrepancy between the scores of the two groups.

It is generally believed by most educators that good classroom management and proper student behavior in a favorable environment is necessary for maximum learning to take place. The children in the target group worked, at least for part of the day, in an environment where they could interact with other children and materials, make decisions, and express themselves freely. Behavior modification techniques were used where rules had to be followed and rewards earned. Children in the control group were instructed in a rigid basal reading program and

received little specialized training in language development skills. Very few positive behavior modification techniques were used. Interaction with other students and materials and freedom of expression in most cases were seldom allowed.

Children in the target group exhibited a more positive attitude toward reading and school after program implementation. It is felt that this more favorable attitude contributed much to the improvement made by these students. High interest and enthusiasm generated by work successfully accomplished in center instruction seemed to enhance the learning of the students in the target group involved in this study.

Chapter 5

Recommendations

The results and conclusions of this study led to several recommendations by the researcher to aid in refining the program and its implementation. It is suggested that the following recommendations be considered:

1. facilitate programs of inservice education for teachers in understanding disadvantaged children, behavior modification, and in using a learning center approach for management and instruction in the classroom;
2. provide early screening and intense assessment of the language development skills of beginning first grade children;
3. implement the program at the beginning of the school year rather than in the middle to avoid possible changes in classroom routine;
4. use an entire class as a target group and another class as a control group to eliminate any possible friction or envy among classmates;
5. add center materials that include taped activities for four or five students to use at a listening center at one time, and learning center activities for partner teaching/learning;
6. construct a "Center-Makings" station early in the program so children can be involved in making their own learning center materials;
7. schedule a time for students who are absent to make up

their learning center instruction assignments;

8. schedule regular class meetings, more if needed, to discuss problems that may arise, to review center rules, and to gain input from the students. Permit students to also call such meetings;

9. plan follow-on programs in language development skills for next year for the students involved in the study; and

10. extend this study to include other socio-economic status groups and other areas of learning skills.

Taking into account the results and conclusions drawn from the study, it was intended by the researcher to share her program and experiences with other teachers. Teachers in the same school as the writer expressed interest in the study and in using a learning center approach for instruction. The researcher, being a primary resource teacher, was in a position to respond to their interest.

At the onset of this practicum, the researcher made center signs, learning stations, interest and exploratory centers, listening center activities, and all of the learning center materials used by the target group as well as the other children in the classroom. Approximately 100 learning center activities and about 15 listening activity tapes were made. Four first grade teachers and two second grade teachers have asked to use these materials and for assistance in setting up their rooms in learning center environments. It was decided that, at the beginning of the next school year, all aspects of the center material

will be placed in a first grade classroom on a semester basis. During this time, the researcher will assist the teacher in making her own materials and in organizing her classroom. At the end of the first semester, the materials will be placed in another teacher's room and the procedure will be repeated.

It is also the intent of the researcher to write up the strategy used to implement this practicum in handbook form. It will then be used in learning center inservice workshops presented by the writer and shared with teachers in the county.

Bibliography

Allen, R. V., & Allen, C. Language Experience Activities. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1976.

Amoto, D. R., Carroll, A. D., Clodfelter, C. A., Gaines, L. S., Hamp, E. D., Harris, P. L., Lucero, J. A., & Williams, M. C. Get Ready! T.E., (3rd ed.). New York: Harper and Row, 1976.

And All This is Reading. Rockville, Md.: Montgomery County Public Schools, 1967. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 044 414)

Artley, A. S. Individual differences and reading instruction. The Elementary School Journal, 1981, 82, 144-152.

Blackburn, J. E., & Powell, W. C. One at a Time All at Once. Calif: Goodyear, 1976.

Borba, C., & Borba, M. The Good Apple Guide to Learning Centers. Hamilton, Ill.: Hamilton Press, 1978.

Brierly, M. G., & Robinson, B. Language Development Component: Primary Evaluation Report. Columbus, Ohio: Columbus Public Schools, 1971. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 061 348)

Donoghue, M. R. The Child and the English Arts. Calif.: Wm. C. Brown Co., 1971.

Davidson, T., & Steely, J. Learning Centers With No-Yet Readers. Calif.: Goodyear, 1978.

Distar Language I (2nd ed.). Chicago: Research Associates, Inc., 1976.

Fillmer, H. T., Lefcourt, A., Thompson, N. C., Coon, G. E., & Cramer, B. B. Patterns of Language T.E. New York: American Book Co., 1974.

Hess, R. D., & Croft, D. J. Teachers of Young Children. Houghton Mifflin, 1975.

James, H. J. Maximum use of a learning center. The Florida Reading Quarterly, 1975, II (2), 5-10.

Koeller, S. Concept building through vocabulary development. The Elementary School Journal, 1981, 82, 137-141.

Lee, D. M., & Allen, R. V. Learning to Read Through Experience (2nd ed.). New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1963.

Leeper, S. H., Dales, R. J., Skipper, D. S., & Witherspoon, R. L. Good Schools for Young Children (3rd ed.). New York: Macmillan, 1974.

Markovitch, M. Applause! Applause! Curtain Opens on Center Activity. Unpublished manuscript, 1980. (Available from 1300 Sunset Blvd., Daytona Beach, Fl.)

McKee, P., & Harrison, M. L. Getting Ready to Read T.E. (4th ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1966.

Meshover, L., & Robinson, V. B. The World of Language T.E. A Guide and Resource Book. Chicago: Follett, 1970.

New Adventure in Learning Adoption Information. Florida: U. S. General Report, 1978. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 166 645)

Nurss, J. R., & McGauvran, M. E. Handbook of Skill Development Activities for Young Children (Language Section). New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1976.

Rowell, C. G. An attitude scale for reading. The Reading Teacher, 1968, 25, 442-447.

Schwartz, J. I. Integrating the Day Through Language Experience. Chicago Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English, 1976. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 141 765)

Shipe, D., Miezitis, S. A pilot study in the diagnosis and remediation of special learning disabilities in preschool children. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 1969, 2, 579-592.

Spache, R. Reading Activities for Child Development, Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1972.

Stansell, J. C. Learning Centers in the Classroom: Frills or Fundamentals? Indianapolis, Indiana: National Conference on Language Arts in the Elementary School, 1978. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 155 720.

Werner, P. Teaching language through movement. Journal of Physical Education and Recreation, 1981, 52, (2), 24-25. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. EJ 243 173)

Wheat, T. E., Galen, N. E., & Norwood, M. Initial reading experiences for linguistically diverse learners. The Reading Teacher, 1979, 32, 28-31.

Winkler, R., & Paro, M. A functional reteaching program. The Reading Teacher, 1972, 25, 409-413.

READING/SCHOOL ATTITUDE SURVEY

Yes	No	1. Do you Like to read?
Yes	No	2. Do you like to get a book for a present?
Yes	No	3. Do you like to read books for fun at home?
Yes	No	4. Do you like the reading group you are in?
Yes	No	5. Do you like to read out loud to your group?
Yes	No	6. Do you think your group likes to hear you read?
Yes	No	7. Do you like to read to yourself?
Yes	No	8. Do you think you are a good reader?
Yes	No	9. Does your teacher think you are a good reader?
Yes	No	10. Do you like to go to the library and check out books?
Yes	No	11. Do you like school?
Yes	No	12. Do the other children in the class like you?
Yes	No	13. Do you like to stay home from school?
Yes	No	14. Do you like to come to school every day?
Yes	No	15. Do you like to do your school work?
Yes	No	16. Do you like to work by yourself?
Yes	No	17. Do the other people at school really care about you?
Yes	No	18. Do you like the other children in your class?
Yes	No	19. Do you wish you were in a different class?
Yes	No	20. Do you think school is an exciting place to be?

DATE _____ STUDENT'S NAME _____

SCHOOL _____ TEACHER'S NAME _____

Appendix B: The Center Ticket

CENTER TICKET

Name _____

Date _____

Learning Stations

1. Listening Comp.	
2. Basic Concepts	
3. Classification	
4. Oral Expression	

Appendix C: Center Instruction Skill Strands

Center Activities		Learning Stations				Skills															
Code: 1. Tape 2. Manipulative 3. Bulletin Board 4. File Folder Game 5. Interest 6. Exploratory		Listening Comprehension	Basic Concepts	Classification	Oral Expression	Main Idea	Details	Sequence	Inferences	Cause and Effect	Spatial Concepts	Right - Left	Basic Size	Quantitative Concepts	Temporal Concepts	One Category	Two or more Categories	Words: Information	Asks Questions	Sentences: Grammatical	Stories: Structure Middle, End
Code	Center Title																				
1,4	Ask Mr. Bear	•	•				•	•				•									
1,4	Gingerbread Boy	•	•				•	•				•									
1,4	The Three Bears	•	•				•	•	•			•									
2	Make-a-Pig	•	•					•				•									
2	Bugs Bunny	•	•					•				•									
2	Porky Pig	•	•					•				•									
2	Porky's Neighbors																				
	(4 sets)	•					•			•											
2,4	Blondie	•	•		•			•				•							•	•	
2	Boy and Bike	•	•		•			•				•							•	•	
1	Is that Right?	•	•			•	•				•		•								
	(8 sets and tapes)																				

Appendix C: Center Instruction Skill Strands

Center Activities		Learning Stations	Skills																			
Code: 1. Tape 2. Manipulative 3. Bulletin Board 4. File Folder Game 5. Interest 6. Exploratory			Listening Comprehension	Basic Concepts	Classification	Oral Expression	Main Idea	Details	Sequence	Inferences	Cause and Effect	Spatial Concepts	Right - Left	Basic Size	Quantitative Concepts	Temporal Concepts	One Category	Two or more categories	Words: Information, Asks Questions	Sentences: Grammatical structure	Stories: Beginning, Middle, End
Code	Center Title																					
2	The Shape of Things			•	•								•			•					
6-2	Magnetism "Yes-No"				•												•				
6-2	Think and Feel				•												•	•			
5-2	"Magicians"			•									•	•							
5	Listening Center		•			•	•				•										•
6	"This and That"			•	•	•								•		•	•	•	•		
5	"Time Out"			•											•						
4	Jill Finds a Dime					•												•	•		
4	Don's Job					•												•	•		
6	Pretending					•												•	•	•	
5	Small Talk					•												•	•		
5	Wet and Wild					•												•	•		

Center Activities		Learning Stations	Skills																		
Code: 1. Tape 2. Manipulative 3. Bulletin Board 4. File Folder Game 5. Interest 6. Exploratory			Listening Comprehension	Basic Concepts	Classification	Oral Expression	Main Idea	Details	Sequence	Inferences	Cause and Effect	Spatial Concepts	Right - Left	Basic Size	Quantitative Concepts	Temporal Concepts	One Category	Two or more categories	Words: Information, Asks Questions	Sentences: Grammatical structure	Stories: Beginning, Middle, End
Code	Center Title																				
1,4	Which Picture?		•					•													
2	At the Beach		•	•			•	•	•	•	•				•						
2	Who, What, When?		•				•	•	•	•	•										
1	The Dark Night		•	•					•						•						
1,4	Pic/Story Interp.		•					•													
1,4	Pic/Sound Match		•					•													
1,4	Sounds and Pictures		•					•													•
1,4	Looking for Thimble		•			•			•		•										
4	Rhyming Riddles		•					•													•
4	The Muddy Skunk		•			•	•	•	•	•	•									•	
4	Riddle-Riddle		•			•	•	•	•	•	•									•	
3-2	Left-Right			•		•						•	•							•	

Appendix C: Center Instruction Skill Strands

Center Activities		Learning stations				Skills														
Code: 1. Tape 2. Manipulative 3. Bulletin Board 4. File Folder Game 5. Interest 6. Exploratory		Listening Comprehension	Basic Concepts	Classification	Oral Expression	Main Idea	Details	Sequence	Inferences	Cause and Effect	Spatial Concepts	Right-Left	Basic Size	Quantitative Concepts	Temporal Concepts	One Category	Two or more categories	Words: Information, Asks Questions	Sentences: Grammatical structure	Stories: Beginning, Middle, End
Code	Center Title																			
2,4	Which Sentence?	•				•	•													
2,4	Which Title?	•				•												•		•
1,4	Little Red Hen	•			•			•										•		•
1,4	Nursery Rhymes	•			•		•	•										•		•
2,4	Elmer and Beanstalk	•			•		•	•	•	•								•		•
2,4	Story Starters	•			•			•										•		•
2,4	Elmer's Garden	•	•		•			•		•			•					•		•
2,4	3 Stories	•			•			•	•											•
2,4	"The Thing"	•			•		•													•
2	Mother and Penny	•			•			•										•		
2	Petunia-Story Cards (4 sets)	•								•										

Appendix D: Center Instruction Skill Strands: The Addition of a Learning Station

Center Activities		Learning Stations				"New"	Skills - Children's Choice																
Code: 1. Tape 2. Manipulative 3. Bulletin Board 4. File Folder Game 5. Interest 6. Exploratory		Listening Comprehension	Basic Concepts	Classification	Oral Expression	Center-Makings	Details	Sequence	Inferences	Cause and Effect	Spatial Concepts	Right - Left	Basic Size	Quantitative Concepts	Temporal Concepts	One Category	Two or more Categories	Words: Information, Asks Questions	Sentences: Grammatical Structure	Stories: Beginning, Middle, End	Main Idea		
Code	Center Title																						
5	Make It-Take It					•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•		

Appendix C: Center Instruction Skill Strands

Center Activities		Learning stations	Skills																			
Code: 1. Tape 2. Manipulative 3. Bulletin Board 4. File Folder Game 5. Interest 6. Exploratory			Listening Comprehension	Basic Concepts	Classification	Oral Expression	Main Idea	Details	Sequence	Inferences	Cause and Effect	Spatial Concepts	Right - Left	Basic Size	Quantitative Concepts	Temporal Concepts	One Category	Two or more categories	Words: Information Asks Questions	Sentences: Grammatical structure	Stories: Beginning, Middle, End
Code	Center Title																					
2	Color Windows			•	•								•	•			•					
2	Shape Up!			•	•								•	•		•	•					
2	Cat and Yarn				•											•						
2	In the Dog House				•											•						
2	Sound(It) Match				•												•					
2	String-Across				•								•			•						
2	String-Across				•								•			•						
2	Apples and Worms				•											•						
2	Match 'em!			•	•									•		•						
	(14 main categories)																					
2	Following Directions			•								•										
	(4 activities)																					

Appendix C: Center Instruction Skill Strands.

Center Activities		Learning stations	Skills																		
Code: 1. Tape 2. Manipulative 3. Bulletin Board 4. File Folder Game 5. Interest 6. Exploratory			Listening Comprehension	Basic Concepts	Classification	Oral Expression	Main Idea	Details	Sequence	Inferences	Cause and Effect	Spatial Concepts	Right-Left	Basic Size	Quantitative Concepts	Temporal Concepts	One Category	Two or more categories	Words: Information, Asks Questions	Sentences: Grammatical Structure	Stories: Beginning, Middle, End
Code	Center Title																				
2,4	Picture Stories		•	•		•	•		•				•			•				•	•
	(7 sets)																				
1,2,4	Which Picture?		•	•				•													
1,2,4	Which Picture?		•	•				•				•									
1,2,4	Which Picture?		•	•				•				•									
5	Big Bird's Book Bin		•			•	•													•	•
2,4	Bugs and Friends			•						•		•									
2,4	Bugs Bunny's Week			•											•						
2,4	Seasons of Year			•											•						
2,4	Porky's Opposites			•								•									
2,4	Months of the Year			•											•						
2	Paper Dolls			•								•									

Appendix C: Center Instruction Skill Strands

Center Activities		Learning Stations			Skills																
Code: 1. Tape 2. Manipulative 3. Bulletin Board 4. File Folder Game 5. Interest 6. Exploratory		Listening Comprehension	Basic Concepts	Classification	Oral Expression	Main Idea	Details	Sequence	Inferences	Cause and Effect	Spatial Concepts	Right - Left	Basic Size	Quantitative Concepts	Temporal Concepts	One Category	Two or more Categories	Words: Information, Asks Questions	Sentences: Grammatical	Stories: Structure Middle, End	
Code	Center Title																				
2.3	Arrows		•								•										
6	Curiosity Corner		•	•	•												•	•			